# UNITY

*FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION*

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
*Editor in Chief*

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese } *Associate Editors*

## The Church Faces a New Age

*By* CLARENCE R. SKINNER

## Am I My Brothers' Keeper ?

*By* GEORGE H. SHOAF

## Our Temperance Comradeship with England

*By* WILLIAM C. ALLEN

## Book Reviews

*By* EMANUEL STERNHEIM — LUCIA TRENT

VOLUME CXI NUMBER 1

Chicago, March 6, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

# UNITY

Established 1878

*Published Weekly October to June* — *Subscription $3.00*
*Published Bi-Weekly July to September* — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
*"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"*

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*



*Board of Directors*
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

*Editorial Board*
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

*Poetry Editors*
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

*Editorial Contributors*
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
M. C. OTTO
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

*Foreign Representatives*
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH


## *Contents*


EDITORIAL— Page
Notes ..... 3
The Church Faces a New Age—CLARENCE R. SKINNER ..... 5
Jottings—J. H. H. ..... 9

ARTICLES—
Am I My Brothers' Keeper?—GEORGE H. SHOAF ..... 10
Our Temperance Comradeship with England—WILLIAM C. ALLEN 11

POETRY—
Stretch Out Your Hand—*Corinne Roosevelt Robinson* ..... 3
Poems by Hsieh Ping Hsin, a Chinese Girl ..... 9

THE STUDY TABLE—
A Paradoxical Liberal—EMANUEL STERNHEIM ..... 13
Poets Show the Way—LUCIA TRENT ..... 15

CORRESPONDENCE—
"Civilized Drinking"—OLIVE COLE SMITH ..... 15

THE FIELD—
The C. C. Conference—ROSIKA SCHWIMMER ..... 2


## The Field

*"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."*

### The C. C. Conference

*Occasion:* The Eighth Conference on the Cause and Cure of War. (Abbreviation C. C. C. also stands for Carrie Chapman Catt Conference.)

*Time:* January 17-20 inclusive, 1933.

*Topic:* War and Waste.

*Membership:* Delegates of eleven national women's organizations, comprising one-fifth of the adult women of the U. S. A.

*Place:* In the bowels of the earth, under the Hotel Washington, in the Hall of Nations. Symbolic of life under reign of gas warfare, no windows, no light, no air, no ventilation.

*Acoustics:* Induces physical exercise. Delegates shift constantly in effort to find a position to hear speakers.

*Comfort:* Handbag, pad, pencil and other necessaries sliding from laps of delegates balanced on edges of chairs in effort to hear.

*Time-keeping:* Unparalleled promptness in beginning and ending of meetings. Also smart limitation of speakers to their programmed shortness.

*Interlude:* Frequent adjustment of loud speaker. Its roar does not help delegates beyond first rows, and irritates speakers, throwing their voices forcefully back into their teeth.

*Permanent Chairman:* A middle-aged lady of ample proportions with a charmingly dimpled smile; its permanence (the smile's) is sometimes broken by a chuckle or a solitary shaking with laughter, enviously observed by delegates unable to share in it, because unaware of its reason. One wishes something would make her mad, to see whether she can look serious.

*Publicity management:* Exaggerated term. Publicity handled as if paid for by enemies of Conference.

*Invocations:* The first prayer requested God to bless the officers, the speakers and delegates, leaving visitors and press representatives uncomfortably excluded from divine protection.

*Speakers:* Speakers given full time for address, and the chairmen of the meetings were men. With the exception of the Honorary Chairman, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, most of the time incapacitated by a severe cold, the star speaker, Dr. Mary E. Woolley, and the foreign guest, Mrs. Israel Zangwill. The permanent chairwoman sat through the Conference on the platform like a chaperone in a genteel ladies' finishing school during the male teachers' lessons.

Women were on the program as participants in some stunts: (1) At the Round Table on Disarmament; respectable elderly women and some younger were billed to represent in 1-3 minute speeches the attitudes of different countries on the Disarmament question. (A technique popular on advanced campuses in the training of young girls for the study of international affairs.) (2) As actors in Mrs. Catt's playlet, "Mars takes a Sabbatical." (3) As "participants" in a Seminar on "Peace on the Western

(*Continued on Page* 15)

# UNITY

*"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"*

Volume CXI MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1933 Number 1

### STRETCH OUT YOUR HAND

**Stretch out your hand and take the world's wide gift**
**Of Joy and Beauty. Open wide your soul**
**Down to its utmost depths, and bare the whole**
**To Earth's prophetic dower of clouds that lift**
**Their clinging shadows from the sunlight's rift—**
**The sapphire symphony of seas that roll**
**Full-breasted auguries from deep to shoal,**
**Borne from dim caverns on the salt spray's drift.**
**Open the windows of your wondering heart**
**To God's supreme creation; make it yours,**
**And give to other hearts your ample store;**
**For when the whole of you is but a part**
**Of joyous beauty such as e'er endures,**
**Only by giving can you gain the more!**

—*Corinne Roosevelt Robinson.*
(Dead on February 19th)

---

We have seen few more discerning statements than that of Gilbert Seldes, in his new book, "The Years of the Locust," about Herbert Hoover. "The final judgment on Mr. Hoover," says Mr. Seldes, "does not depend on what he did, but on what capitalism in America does. If it recovers, it will owe more to Mr. Hoover than to any other man." If we recover, in other words, from this depression, and our existing economic order goes on for another generation or two, Mr. Hoover will be rated by posterity as one of the great men of history. We think this opinion is correct. It is based on the fundamental principle that a man's place in history, at least in the field of action, is determined quite as much by what happens as by what he himself actually does. Of course, the supreme great men—Julius Caesar, for example—make things happen. Other great men—Abraham Lincoln, for example—adapt themselves to events, and use what happens to the service of their appointed ends. But most men are simply made or unmade by the processes of time. What is done by forces altogether beyond their control either lifts them to heights of fame or casts them down into pits of infamy. Even Caesar was fortunate in his death. As for Lincoln, what would we be thinking of him had he lost the Civil War, or even had survived into the awful turmoil and bitterness of reconstruction days? Herbert Hoover's fate, as Seldes points out, is all in the laps of the gods. The retiring President has for four years been fighting a desperate rear-guard action in defense of capitalism. If the retreat becomes a rout, Hoover may gain praise for a certain stubborn, perhaps stupid, courage, but his name will be associated ever with a debâcle. But if the capitalistic forces hold together, reorder their lines, and again advance, his greatness will seem immeasurable. The same thing is true of the incoming President, Mr. Roosevelt. The success or failure of his administration all depends not upon what he does or tries to do, but upon forces now operating in the world which are far beyond the control of himself, or of any other man. Capitalism, in our opinion, is dying. The most that can be said for Roosevelt is "that his character," as the *World Tomorrow* puts it, "may determine just how serious the death throes of capitalism are to be in this country, and how much social and political confusion is to accompany the transition."

---

The proposal of certain Congressmen to endow Mr. Roosevelt, on his assumption of office, with dictatorial powers for slashing expenditures, coordinating executive departments, etc., came as near to casting our government into moral bankruptcy as anything that we can think of since the days of James Buchanan. As the President undertook in 1860 to surrender the responsibilities of his great office, so the House and Senate are now proposing to surrender their responsibilities. Although no lawyer, we must believe that such a measure, if enacted, would be unconstitutional, and would be so declared by the Supreme Court. We know of nothing in the Constitution which authorizes any one branch of our government to go out of business in favor of any other branch. But that is not the point! What concerns us, and we think should concern every citizen, is the spectacle of our national legislators publicly confessing that they are either unable or unwilling to face the problems imposed upon them by the state of the nation. What has happened in this last "lame-duck" session would seem to indicate pretty conclusively that the members of Congress as a body have not the intelligence to do their work. When, if ever, has there been seen such bungling and ineptitude! But the trouble lies deeper than this. It touches moral rather than mental factors. For what is really the matter with our Congressmen is cowardice. They have not the courage to cut down the expenditures, and therewith reduce the patronage, upon which depends the favor of their partisan support. Especially do they tremble at the necessity of ending the bonus payments to so-called veterans who never saw a battlefield or suffered a wound. So

they would "pass the buck" to Mr. Roosevelt! We have heard many arguments for the abolishment of Congress, but we never supposed that we would live to see these arguments deliberately sustained by Congress itself.

---

The attempted assassination of Mr. Roosevelt was a dramatic, and in its incidental features, a tragic affair. One instinctively thinks of what would have happened had the attempt upon the life of the President-elect been successful. We imagine that in this case the Hon. "Jack" Garner, of Texas, would have taken the oath of office on March 4th and been formally inducted into the White House. Even with this fortunate escape of Mr. Roosevelt, there still remains the inescapable uncertainty of life during the next four years, and therewith the continuing menace of Garner's succession to the presidential office. All of which brings conspicuously to the front once again the crying scandal of the vice-presidency in this country and of the men who are chosen to this high office! In the classic musical drama, "Of Thee I Sing," this situation is made ridiculous to the point of hilarity. But fundamentally the situation is not ridiculous at all, but alarming. Again and again, indeed regularly each four years, a cheap politician is nominated for the vice-presidency because he happens to be "available" as the phrase is. Frequently, as in the case of the amiable Mr. Curtis, the man selected is simply unimportant and insignificant. But Mr. Garner is not only this, but infinitely more, or rather less. From every higher standpoint of public welfare, this Texas "hack" is probably the most dangerous man who has been named for the second highest office in the land in modern times, and for the next four years we have got to live under the shadow of his presence on the threshold of the White House! Such a situation as this is of course only one more instance of the utter irresponsibility of our political parties. For we should think that, in our brief history as a republic, a sufficient number of vice-presidents had actually entered upon the constitutional succession to the presidency, to teach caution, if not wisdom, in the selection of candidates. The deviation of a hair's breadth in the aim of an assassin's pistol, and in this greatest crisis of the modern world, Mr. Garner would be sitting in the seat of power! Consider that contingency, and eat a hearty meal if you can!

---

We were in Germany when the banks were closed there in the summer of 1931, and thus saw at first hand what it means for an entire community to be without money. Nor did we imagine at that time that our own country would ere long be tasting the same kind of direful experience! But, state by state, we are now proceeding to establish these moratorium periods as the only way of keeping our banks from collapsing utterly. Nevada has been through it, Louisiana, Michigan—and other states are in all probability preparing to take their place in line. That this moratorium device is a measure of desperation is obvious. That it shakes the public confidence in our banking system, and thus in the end makes a bad matter worse, should be manifest. That it proves the complete failure of every endeavor to date to improve the economic situation throughout the country is beyond any possibility of contradiction. The Federal Reserve System was initiated years ago to stabilize our banks and currency and thus prevent just such crises as this—and it avails nothing. Since 1929 other measures have been resorted to, culminating in the great Reconstruction Finance Corporation—and the Michigan debâcle none the less tragically occurs. Of course, it may be argued that things might have been infinitely worse had these defenses against disaster not been reared. But, on the one hand, it is difficult to see how anything could be much worse; and, on the other hand, we are interested not in things not being worse but in their surely becoming better. As it is, our American banking seems to be the shakiest in the world. England has been in the pit of the depression far longer than this country, but her banks carry on much as usual. Germany and Austria have known disasters, but nothing comparable to ours. Canadian banks, functioning in the same climate and under very similar conditions, have kept their heads safely above the flood. It is only in this country that a list of bank failures is published each week along with the statistics of automobile accidents and car-loadings. That such events not only happen, but are allowed to continue as a part of the order of the day, is an outrage. Under these circumstances we blame nobody for withdrawing deposits and hoarding. When there is no security anywhere else, one instinctively and rightly trusts only oneself.

---

The League of Nations has been almost criminally slow in dealing with the Chino-Japanese crisis. Its action, to be effective, should have been taken months ago. At this late date, it will suffer the maximum of harm and achieve the minimum of good. But if it had at last done nothing, it would have sacrificed the final remnants of its repute and influence, and had little left to do but to adjourn *sine die*. So it is a matter of relief, at least, that the League has not in the end been balked, but has actually denounced Japan and fixed anew the standards by which alone the world can hope to live. If Japan withdraws from the League, as seems likely at this writing, it will be something of a calamity, but by no means the complete calamity which would have faced mankind if Japan had remained in the League with China's blood upon her hands and no world rebuke upon her head. The Eastern empire, in the long run, will be the only loser, for outlawry must stand as an ever weightier penalty as time goes on. Furthermore, there are Japan's internal difficulties,

which are growing more serious every hour. If the Jehol campaign takes any such turn as the attack on Shanghai a year ago, it is our guess that not all the resources of Manchukuo can save the Mikado's realm from domestic collapse. The League of Nations has wisely shown the way. Let the world stand by, recognizing nothing that Japan is doing, and wait until this abominable work undoes itself. For Japan is her own worst enemy. She may think she is being frustrated at Geneva, but the real source of her humiliation and ultimate defeat is Tokyo. Meanwhile, the League of Nations, by returning firmly to the basis of action established by the Lytton Report, has done all that can be done to recover the ground lost since the initial invasion of Manchuria. And let it be noted that this victory, for whatever it is worth, is to be credited not to the great powers, who see in Japan only their own embarrassingly faithful disciple, but to the small nations who see clearly that "in union there is strength," and in the League peace!

---

We confess that we are all "het up" over what happened to the production of "Green Pastures" in Washington. Here is a play of classic significance and beauty which has been played by a distinguished Negro cast to acclaiming audiences in many parts of the country for a period of over two years. Whites and blacks have gladly mingled in their witnessing of this great drama. It seemed as though this experience were destined to mark an immeasurable step forward in the reconciliation of the races. Then suddenly, in the capital city of the republic, in a theater appropriately named the National, the Negroes find themselves barred from entrance! No man or woman with a black skin can hope to pass the doors to see his own blood brethren perform in a play dedicated to the spiritual genius of their people. The great scene of the host of bondmen struggling painfully and slowly through the wilderness to their emancipation must take on an added pathos, and also irony, to white audiences, thus adding new indignity and agony to the historic tradition of the Negro. What amazes and also outrages us is the fact that the Negro actors and actresses were willing to be party to this deliberate discrimination against their own. Still worse, it seems to us, was their willingness to give a special "Jim Crow" performance, "for Negroes only." We recognize, of course, that these artists are primarily concerned with their own especial work, and that they are probably under conditions of contract which make action difficult. But a first-class strike against this insult would have been a wholesome thing. We wonder when the Negroes of this country will fully realize that their entrance into the arts gives them their most effective weapon for liberty. When Negro singers refuse to sing, and Negro players to play, in any place where, or at any time when, their brethren are not received on equal terms of hospitality with whites, we shall have gotten somewhere.

---

## The Church Faces a New Age*

The idea of evolution as applied to social institutions gives us a different point of view from that which prevailed in the past. Today we see the rise and fall of many forms, such as governments, educational systems, religions, which seemed static to our forefathers. The idea of *impermanence* is rapidly spreading throughout our culture, and Bergson's concept of the "continual elaboration of the absolutely new" is becoming almost universally accepted.

This evolutionary concept leads to the often-expressed opinion that in due course the church will be out-moded and its day will cease to be. The time may come when it will be classed among the historically interesting antiquities. There are those who, at the present time, can see no reason for the church existing any longer. They do not feel the need of its services; they do not think in terms of ecclesiastical formulae; they point with vehement satisfaction to Russia where the church has been almost eradicated from the scene in a few short years.

Anyone acquainted with history must recognize the possibility of this point of view regarding the church prevailing. The Church as we know it today might pass either violently or slowly into desuetude and decay.

In this twentieth century we have seen thrones, dynasties, and systems crumple before the rising tide of a new creative life. A blind belief in the inevitableness of old institutions is too facile an escape from the realities of change. We must frankly grapple with the fact that we are now in a period of history when a dynamic and daring spirit is abroad: crisis follows crisis with disconcerting suddenness. We must no longer hold pathetically and futilely to the old, merely because it is old, but must gear our minds to swift change, and we must dare to look forth upon a potentially new world.

If an unprejudiced observer were to make a survey of our present civilization, would he recommend that the church be abandoned? Or would he say that it is adequately performing its functions? Or would he conclude that it needs thorough revision in its methodology, to the end that it may become more effective? Let us imagine ourselves in the role of unprejudiced observers, and let us make an appraisal of this institution—the church—which is mercilessly attacked by destructive critics, and sustained by devoted apologists.

*This editorial was originally prepared as an address for the Service of Recognition of Dr. Skinner as Dean of the Crane Theological School, Tufts College, Massachusetts, February 16, 1933.—Editor.

First, shall we report the need for such an institution?

We see everywhere in our cultural system factories for the making of commodities, mines for making available raw materials, vast stretches of farm lands for the production of food, railroads and airplanes for communication, schools and colleges for the training of the mind, hospitals for the conservation and promotion of health, museums for the display of art, gilded palaces for our recreation, stadiums for the development of the body. An unprejudiced observer would unquestionably say that these institutions perform functions that are vital, they represent interests that have sent their roots down into something deep and abiding in human nature. The need for food and clothing, for health, recreation, and for education, is obvious. If we could not now supply those needs through existing machinery we would immediately proceed to build institutions which would satisfy them.

Does the church satisfy any real or fundamental desire on the part of human beings? Or is it simply an institution which has come down through the past as a part of our behavior pattern which we do not dare to outgrow because of the innate conservatism of our thinking?

It is hard for any of us to qualify as an absolutely unbiased observer of this busy contemporary scene; but I cannot help holding the conviction that an objective student will see that life demands some organized expression of man's reach toward the infinite, of his aspiration for the good life here and now, and for those purposes which should become the clear-cut goals for all our eager striving.

Is it enough that we are fed and clothed, that we speed through the air, that we are amused, and that we are trained to master a vocation? Is it not true that the human spirit, in all times and in all places, has cried out in eager desire to know what is the meaning of it all? When satisfied with material goods, when our barns are stuffed with much store, will not that which makes man really man assert itself? What is the significance of being born, of reproducing, of dying? It does not seem conceivable that we who have come up through the long process of physical, mental, and cultural evolution can fold our hands in satisfaction and say, "Soul, thou hast laid up much goods for many years, now thou canst take thine ease." Is there not a flame ready to burst from the smouldering ashes of this material care and superabundance? Is there not a long, long look into the infinite future? Is not man wistful for a sense of fellowship toward the universe?

If the purpose of the church is to proclaim answers to these questions, shall not our observer have to report that the functions of the Church run very deep into the roots of human nature, and that they supply wants which make man man, without which he would sink to the level of dreamless cattle?

If, as the poet says:

'Tis the sublime of man, his noon-tide majesty,
To know himself parts and proportions of one wondrous whole,

then the function of the Church is to proclaim in regal tones this majestic fact.

If it is necessary in the midst of our mechanistic and scientific civilization to set up ethical objectives, then the function of the Church is to make an authentic definition of the purposes of our modern social order. If man is groping in cynicism and doubt, paralyzed with his inability to see meaning in modern confusion, then it is the function of the Church to blow the certain trumpet of faith which will give meaning and purpose to life.

Secondly, shall we report that the institution is adequately performing these functions?

Here we do not have to rely so completely upon our own individual, unaided judgment, for many reports have been made by competent observers regarding the inefficiency of the Church. By almost common consent it has been losing ground in comparison with other institutions. Part of this process is inevitable because of the fact that our social order is made up of so many more organizations than in the past. These have very properly taken over some of the functions that were formerly the sole prerogative of the Church. Religion in primitive times owed part of its superior status, not merely to its own innate greatness, but to the paucity of its rivals. Men were poor in art, education, and science. Their command of the forces of matter was feeble. Their lives were often filled with ennui and boredom. Under such conditions, religion was resorted to as something available to make life full and significant. It is inevitable, therefore, in a world like ours, that religion cannot hold its former place, and the old New England type of meeting-house church can no longer expect to be the center of community activities or the chief distributor of high culture. The fact that should give us pause is not so much that of the restricted sphere of religion and the Church, as the efficiency of religious institutions within their present restricted sphere.

Many influences within the Church as well as without indicate a lessening control over the lives of individuals and a weakening influence on the purposes of the modern world. Other professions vie with that of the ministry in calling young men of superior ability to their ranks, so that the Church has lost what was almost a monopoly of intellectual abilities in its leadership. Sectarianism has become rife, splitting the effectiveness of the Church as an organization which should stand in solid phalanx for the best life in every community. Divisions and endless subdivisions have caused a loss of power until today the basis for fellowship in the modern Protestant Church is so narrow that it no

longer unites those of a common Christian tradition. The institution has lost some of its pristine vigor and courage; the time was not so far distant when mighty prophets thundered from the pulpits of Europe and America without compromise, unafraid of their constituency. Preachers grappled with real issues and did not faint in struggling with real evils. Today there is a tendency to proclaim only those truths which are accepted without opposition. We have become subservient to the dominant economic powers of the times.

We know that a smaller proportion of the community is attending the services of the Church than formerly. Part of this condition is to be explained, as I have already said, in terms of a richer life which supplies many more interests and stimuli. It is not wholly a case of people forsaking that which is good for a commercialized evil. The automobile, theater, radio, and press supply many people with vital satisfactions. The Church of today has not kept pace in its appeal to the people's loyalty and interest, despite the fact that here and there individual men are able to crowd their auditoriums, and despite the fact that occasionally there are ripples of revivals such as at the present time of depression. It is hardly to be doubted that the Church has been fighting a slowly losing battle. We admit this fact with a sense of our own failure and only after the greatest reluctance. We are glad to render our homage to those who, under adverse conditions, are bravely carrying on.

It may be said that in general the established sects of Protestantism have lost their creativeness. They lack a sense of urgency and driving power. Both pulpit and pew have lost much of greatness which redeemed the inefficiencies of the past and lifted religion to a commanding place in our lives.

There are, however, hopeful signs of a reviving effectiveness in the Church; in the first place, because of a new interest which is being taken in children and young people. Religious education in the technical sense is far more advanced in the churches than it was fifty years ago. There are signs that in the Protestant fellowship beauty is again being integrated into its services of worship. Programs of community service are increasing. There is a stirring of criticism and unrest among both laity and ministry which bespeaks an honest facing of the realistic facts, and that cannot but be a sign of promise.

Our committee, therefore, will have to report with regret that the Protestant churches have been losing their grip upon the individual's loyalty and their claim for the social effectiveness of their gospel is not wholly justified. At the same time we recognize an earnest desire to grapple with inefficiencies and we recognize that in some departments, as in religious education, it has made great and significant strides toward progress.

This leads us, then, to the third alternative, namely, reporting that there should be a thorough-going reappraisal of the technique and methods of ecclesiastical institutions. We reiterate our stanch belief that the functions which we have associated with the Church are so necessary to human life that they will be performed by some group of people under one name or another. The sole question before us is whether the Church can be great enough to measure up to its opportunities.

Let us make some concrete recommendations which might make a contribution toward the solution of this confused problem.

In the first place, let us recognize that in a world where cultural change is extremely rapid, and technique is almost daily improved, it must realize that there is nothing sacrosanct about present methods of worship or so-called "order of service." In the theaters people can hear magnificent organs playing good music and sometimes can hear chorus choirs of one or two hundred voices, well trained. Can we expect to attract people to religious services if the best they have to offer is a wheezy organ, a faltering organist, and six poor singers squeaking psalm tunes through their noses? Not only must the technique of worship be greatly enriched with more beauty and with higher standards of art, but the very concept of worship itself must be reoriented into our modern scientific age. One of the great needs of ritual today is a new terminology. There is no reason why people should heartily join in hymns which they do not believe or read blood-thirsty psalms, the sentiments of which they cordially despise. We must find contemporary and authentic literature which will express our aspirations in as effective a way as the Psalms expressed the ideology and aspirations of twenty-five hundred years ago. We must dare to vary the technique of worship by introducing those dramatic elements which appeal to the emotions, such as moments of impressive silence, enriched symbolism, and gorgeous pageantry. Attempts are being made along these lines and we shall eagerly await some conclusions from the experience. There must be an opportunity for a service which provides a genuine religious experience, which implies not so much preaching as poetry and the appropriate forms of beauty.

In the second place, the Church must speak a new language both of science and of psychology. As the number and age of people attending school rises the willingness to submit to antiquated ideology will decrease. Some persons are capable of storing their religion in the refrigerators of medieval theology, but modernity for most of us will demand a more integrated expression of the religious life. I do not believe personally that people will or ought to come to church primarily to hear a discussion of the latest discoveries in astronomy or physics. I do not believe that the new knowledge about the structure of the atom need pro-

foundly affect our religious and ethical point of view, but I am strongly convinced that as the scientific method of thinking spreads rapidly throughout the world, leaders of religion will have to be cognizant of scientific facts and their preachments will at least have to be not diametrically opposed to what we believe today in the laboratory. The spectacle of many belated theologians attempting to desperately defend outworn conceptions of geology and cosmology is anything but edifying, and is bound to bring ultimate disrepute upon both the clergy and the Church.

Again, it is becoming generally recognized that the Church must pass from the basis of sectarianism to a new kind of functional unity. As long as there cannot be conclusive answers to the speculative problems of theology and metaphysics it will be impossible to lay the foundations of the Church in a dogmatic creed. In the old days when people believed in the revelation from God of a final truth through the Scriptures, it was possible to take one text and found a fellowship upon it; but today when that belief is being displaced by the scientific attitude, no Biblical statement or incident is sufficient for a basis of religious fellowship. The day of the sect is rapidly disappearing. This does not mean that all freedom must likewise disappear, that uniformity will emerge, and that there can be no divergences of practice or ideas. It rather means that the basis of church organization must become broader and more vital. Men will gather together for the expression of their religious and ethical life not because they believe together a common speculative dogma but because they live together a common way of life; they will be drawn into bonds of union by common purposes and covenants.

The result of this new functional unity will inevitably necessitate all Churches emphasizing expression of aspirations of the human race which are basic. A new kind of fundamentalism will emerge—not that of creed but of practice, not that of textual interpretation but of character. The emphasis will be increasingly placed where it belongs, upon those realities which really matter, which broaden the outlook of man, deepen his consecration, and lead toward the good life. This unity will not be superficially enforced but rather will come as a natural reaction from facing together the perils of our modern world. The common recognition of dangers in our mechanized civilization, the shared realization of injustices and crime, will greatly draw together those who are striving for mental and spiritual values.

The next recommendation which we unhesitatingly make is that there shall be a new individualism in the Church, employing a new technique of treatment. It is true that one of the chief functions of the ministry has always been, and probably will always continue to be, the helping of men and women to solve their personal problems. The old method of the confessional was psychologically sound, but its technique in the Protestant Church cannot be accepted. The personal worker in the modern parish will have to lay a new emphasis upon the importance of the individual with whom he comes into contact, realizing that it is difficult or impossible to solve many of the intimate problems merely by the method of preaching. Abnormal psychology and the technique of psychiatry both give us to understand that persons cannot be dealt with merely by generalized formulae. Divorces, drugs, fears, inferiorities, cruelties, inefficiences, the sense of futility, cynicism; all these problems which are common in the laboratory of the minister are so intensely and uniquely individual that the physician of souls will have to adopt the modern scientific approach. Already the offices of psychiatrists are crowded. If the ministry of the Church is to maintain its advantage in this field it must increasingly compete with the well-organized technique of personal helpfulness. I do not believe that every minister should set himself up as a psychiatrist, no matter how well he may be equipped, but I do believe that he should be armed with a sufficient knowledge of this field to know problems when he meets them, and to give sympathetic treatment to cases which are not too much involved. Because the minister is daily in the homes of his people and because his followers look upon him as a friend, he has great opportunities which are not shared by the physician and the professional psychological worker.

In the next place, we recommend that more emphasis be placed upon education as a method. It is interesting to note in this connection that the Christian Science Church, which has made more growth in the last fifty years than any other denominational group, has never employed the method of preaching. It has grown by making the issues of life clearly understood by requiring a certain amount of study every day on the part of its devotees. Christian Science, whether rightly or wrongly, has become a way of living, a philosophy of life. Its practitioners do not depend upon vague principles or upon emotional drives, but rather upon an ordered educational system. If the modern Church were to adopt this method I believe its efficiency might be increased one hundred-fold. Those of us who as teachers periodically go through the experience of correcting examination papers realize how unsafe the lecture or preaching method is for imparting knowledge. I heartily believe in the great preacher. I think no mechanism or method will replace the great spirit, who, stirred by a mighty vision, blazes forth the convictions of his heart. I believe that this service of the preacher must be supplemented by something which follows up in greater detail his work. As already stated, the method of religious education has been increasingly introduced into churches. I believe that it should spread until it includes all adults as well as all children.

Finally, may we recommend that the Church should

catch a new vision of its social purposes. If life is to be lived at its best, if individuals are to find an enriching experience, they must be able to build that kind of social order which provides a rich and noble vision. If our civilization is to be torn by fratricidal war, by economic competition which drives men to chicanery and fraud, or vulgar display of materialism, the life of the individual is bound to be affected for the worse. If the Church expects men to live according to the Christ-like character, it must grapple with the great determining forces moulding the world. It must insist upon the brotherhood of nations, upon a co-operative spirit in industry; it must ask the question, what is our civilization for, and answer in no uncertain terms.

The mechanism of the present-day Church is geared mostly to an old type of individualism. It has inherited the gospel of personal salvation apart from social salvation. It must come to think of its purpose and message in broader terms. Sociology emphasizes the fact that the individual is a product of as well as a creator of social forces; the highest type of individual comes by making him the creator not of a monkish life withdrawn from his fellow men but of the kingdom of God on this earth.

The plight of the Russian Church today is an example of what may overcome ecclesiasticism everywhere when it runs to seed; when it loses its socially creative vision. The Russian Church became an end in itself, lost touch with the vital interests and needs of men. When or if that condition takes place in America the Church will deserve death. When or if the Church in America awakens to its sense of social responsibility as a determiner of destiny, it will again live.

CLARENCE R. SKINNER.

---

# Jottings

Los Angeles, Feb. 16.—(A. P.)—Detectives investigating the 1931 stay in Los Angeles of Joseph Zangara, who shot at President-elect Roosevelt, said tonight they had found records indicating he had registered here as a Republican voter.

Why was there not an immediate round-up of all Republicans throughout the nation? Surely there can be no safety for the republic, if we tolerate a group which thus breed assassins!

---

When the banks closed in Michigan, hoarders became suddenly popular. These hoarders were the only ones who had cash to keep life going. Perhaps hoarding is not such a sin, after all!

---

Albert Bigelow Paine has written a biography of Lillian Gish, and John Drinkwater of Carl Laemmle. Now Upton Sinclair has done William Fox. Big bowls for little fish!

When is a president of the United States popular? Just before he takes office and just before he leaves it. In between these two extremes lie the long ranges of official hell.

---

There is nothing in this world so bad that it may not do good. Thus, we are reminded by the chairman of the Committee on Mosquito Extermination of the New Jersy Federation of Women's Clubs, that we should not mourn that mosquitoes are still unexterminated in New Jersey, for "swarms of healthy, ambitious mosquitoes will see to it that there never is an epidemic of petting" in that state.

---

The present government of Russia—a "combination of lunatics and scoundrels," says Mr. H. L. Mencken. Another one of his "prejudices"!

J. H. H.

---

## Poems by Hsieh Ping Hsin, a Chinese girl

[Translated from the Chinese by GRACE M. BOYNTON]

**The Poet's Duty**

O Poet,
Be careful in your writing;
The misery of human beings
Craves comfort from your pen.

* * *

**The Twenty-One Demands**

Acts of repression
Give rise to thoughts of liberty.

* * *

**Japanese Policy in China**

The cry of the cock
Excites the others;
Can he himself know peace?

* * *

**The Poet's Service**

The poet from his heart
Drops out the blood of happiness and sorrow,
And thus unconsciously
Brings forth the flowers of sympathy in the world.

**Armistice Day Internationally Celebrated in Peking**

The vast sea sharply separates nationalities.
O children under the Cross,
Over the pure water—
Are you only exchanging polite indifferent smiles?

* * *

**Experience Supersedes Reason**

Faith takes a young man,
And after she leads him up to high pagoda of obedience,
The ladder of thought is superfluous.

* * *

**To the Young Literati**

Pioneers!
On the perilous point of the lofty peak
Do you open your eyes and look down?
Even though you are free,
You ought to think
Of humanity's bitter toil.

# Am I My Brothers' Keeper?

This question, with its implications, has been pondered affirmatively and negatively by moralists and philosophers since it was first put to the world. Irrespective of the circumstances under which it was asked, the very nature of the question implies an affirmative answer. Indirectly sequential to this question, and closely related to it, is the statement of the Man of Galilee to the effect that "Whosoever shall seek to save his life, shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life, shall save it." To the individualist, to those who accept the doctrine of *laissez faire,* to the advocates of more business in government and less government in business, both the question and the statement are paradoxical and meaningless. Yet around the question and statement revolves the social and economic problems of modern life.

Obviously, under conditions as they exist in modern capitalism, it is impossible for man to be his brother's keeper except at the cost of unappreciated sacrifice. Giving charity as an investment against revolution fits in with the capitalist program, but the bestowal of charity, whether of alms or of intellectual and spiritual concession, as a matter of principle, is not in harmony with the rules of capitalism as they are played. This idea of losing one's life in order to find it is an idea so foreign to the thinking of capitalist-minded individualists that none of them gives it serious consideration.

The great curse of the present order, unquestionably, is social and economic irresponsibility. What the slaveholders of the old South wanted, and what they demanded, was to be let alone. Their consciences applauded their "peculiar" institutions, which were their own and for which they held themselves sectionally responsible; and they fought a bloody war for the right to do as they liked with their own. The modern industrialist and financier —the owners of modern industry—obsessed with the same psychology and maintaining a similar attitude, take much the same position as did the southern slavocracy. In both instances, the slave owner and the owners of modern industry were fortified by the legalities of society. Ownership in each instance was a constitutional guarantee. They were satisfied with their respective situations. Slave owner and corporation owner alike loudly championed the federal Constitution, and they opposed change.

Now what, practically, does present-day capitalism stand for? Among its outstanding claims are the rights of the individual to acquire and hold property, exploit his fellows for a profit, and live his life as he pleases, subject, of course, to laws of his own initiative and enactment. Always the emphasis is upon "me" and "mine." Private initiative and the unrestrained liberty of the individual are matters cherished and pronounced. Under capitalism the race is to the swift and the battle to the strong. But in running the race and fighting the battle the rules that govern are those of "tooth and claw." Capitalistic environment and procedure are not conducive to altruism; instead, they make for human selfishness at its worst. The characteristics and activities of the jungle have been carried over into capitalism; and, instead of being a system, as many call it, capitalism is sheer social, economic and political anarchy.

By natural law and otherwise, I am my brother's keeper; but I cannot be my brother's keeper under capitalism. In the riotous struggle for self-preservation, I am compelled to be my brother's exploiter, but not his keeper. Because of the intensity of the fight for existence under competitive capitalism, I am forced to disavow the ideals of justice and love, deny the higher and nobler instincts of my being, and join in the mad anarchy of fraud, hypocrisy, crime and war. I cannot act on the principle of finding my life by losing it, for so to act would be both politically senseless and socially absurd; it would be worse than either of these—it would be economically suicidal.

Perhaps the most confusing feature of capitalism is the unwillingness of its victims to unite with radicals for its overthrow. Fifteen million unemployed and forty million destitute men, women and children today constitute the ripe fruit of our American economic order. Of this number of social and economic outcasts, only an imperceptible percentage is in a state of either actual or potential rebellion against the system that made them what they are. Large numbers of the disinherited are committing suicide without striking back at the causes of their distress, and larger numbers are finding pauper's graves ignorant of the reasons why they went to untimely deaths. The stoutest adversaries against which Socialists and Communists today are hurling themselves are not the beneficiaries of predatory privilege; they are the men and women of the working and workless classes who still cling to the traditions and empty promises of the capitalist system.

Some one, speaking of the possibility and advisability of making an escape from present hell into a future heaven, said: "Ye must be born again." It was not meant by this that actual physical rebirth was necessary, but that the individual, in order to equip himself for translation from the old into the new, had to experience intellectual change. He had to understand mentally the insufficiency and unworthiness of the old, and the desirability and timeliness of the new, if he hoped to put himself in a position where he would be prepared to repudiate the old and choose the new. Millions of the American people, at this moment, desperately need to experience such a rebirth.

Upholders of capitalism are still blindly groping in the dark. Their interpretation of religion and their individualistic philosophy are no longer practicable under modern social conditions. Their eighteenth century viewpoint is completely outdated by the social process. A social animal, man cannot live to himself alone. He must find comradeship with his kind. He must be his brother's keeper. He can really and truly maintain the integrity of his soul only by losing self in the common service. To become aware that he is groping in the dark, that his old ideas of religion and philosophy are no longer adequate, that he must transfer the emphasis from serving self to serving others, are matters

which constitute the supreme demand of the hour.

The full sweep of events the world over is away from the narrow and selfish individualism of the past to the cooperative society of the future. The day is gone, if it was ever here, when the individual can become the "self-made" man. More than aught else the present depression has revealed the internationalism of society, despite its competing capitalisms. It is impossible for one nation to remain prosperous in the midst of a stricken world. Equally impossible and of profound significance is the fact that one man or group of men may not keep or enjoy wealth in the presence of human want.

Americans in this crisis must not only analyze the economic scene and scheme; they must analyze themselves. They must discard illusions, and get right down to the bedrock of social reality. Difficult as it is, they must lay aside their prejudices, open their eyes and minds, investigate facts without fear or favor, learn the truth of social and economic development, and follow that truth to the bitter or glorious end. Only by so doing will they acquit themselves like men, and be ready for the society that is to be.

Competitive capitalism is in a state of incipient collapse. Its ultimate doom is inevitable. Trying to keep it erect with pillars and props is wasted effort. The sensible procedure is to hasten its fall, organizing, meanwhile, for its replacement. With the disappearance of capitalism will go the exploiting classes, the individuals of private initiative and selfish greed, and all who loveth or maketh a lie. In its place, provided the workers arise and adequately prepare, will come organized, coordinated and planned economy, on a basis of common ownership and common operation for the common good, with the emancipated workers, all-powerful, in control.

The anarchy of capitalism, with its lack of plan, purpose or objective, must give way to the order of collectivism, if humanity is to continue to advance. Increasing world population and diminishing natural resources necessitate the replacement of unrestricted individualism with responsible social and economic organization. Soviet Russia must not be the only country that achieves the distinction of having stepped out from the darkness of chaos into the light of planned economy and responsible social order. Around the world the nations must abolish private ownership for private profit, cut out every opportunity for human exploitation, and inaugurate the Commonwealth of Man. When that is done a league of Cooperative Commonwealths will displace the League of Competitive Capitalist Nations; all incentive to crime and war will be removed; man then, indeed, will become his brother's keeper; and for the first time since Christ uttered them, the words reading: "Whosover shall seek to save his life shall lose it; and whosoever shall lose his life shall save it," will become pregnant with meaning.

George H. Shoaf.

---

## Our Temperance Comradeship with England

At a meeting of the Royal Licensing Commission, Dr. Alfred Salter, M. P., stated sometime ago that while there was not the same amount of gross and bestial intoxication in his district, in South London, that obtained twenty years ago, the amount paid for alcoholic drinks therein exceeds the amount spent on bread, milk, rent and taxes, all put together. Nearly five times as much beer as milk is drunk in his poverty-stricken district and this represents £11.4.0 ($55.00) per head per annum. He said: "The worse the social environment the greater is the proportional expenditure on alcohol."

The estimated expenditure for drink in the United Kingdom for the year 1928 was £288,000,000 ($1,440,000,000). There was a small increase last year. Undoubtedly the amount of intoxicants consumed by the "working classes" is less than 20 years ago. The money cost however is much larger.

Frank H. Chambers, a minister of Southend-on-Sea, said of the behavior of day-trippers in that resort: "The women who arrive about noon are not all sober, but many go immediately to public houses and remain there drinking until 2:30 p. m. The conduct of these women often becomes disgusting." This is only one little bit of evidence. The writer has frequently seen horrid sights when wandering about London. Such sights were familiar to some degree in some parts of America years ago. An ell now granted to the liquor interests of our country will lead to their seizing a yard in the future and familiarize our boys and girls with scenes now generally unknown to them under the Eighteenth Amendment.

Profits of the English brewers in times of bitter unemployment and financial stress continue greatly to increase. Referring to the financial recovery of breweries during and since the war, G. Bailey Wilson, political and literary secretary of the United Kingdom Alliance, has said "Out of the holocaust of the war the breweries rose phoenix-like to untold heights of wealth." You have only to look at the annual statements of the big brewery concerns, as reported in the financial columns of the London newspapers, to see that this statement is correct. The increase in beer duty of three shillings per barrel, it is claimed is more than made up by the brewers in the decline in prices of the chief raw materials used in the business. It has been testified that the licensees dare not tell of the bondage in which the brewers hold them, some licensees saying: "We are nearly slaves, we have to do what we are told." With newspapers, wealth, social prestige usually, and sometimes government, on their side the brewers largely have things their own way. Shall America take the chances of reverting to such a situation?

G. Bailey Wilson also declared before the Royal Commission: "The brewing industry is a trade of the well-to-do. . . . In four London brewing companies I have counted among the shareholders 46 peers, 20 peeresses, 161 lords, ladies and honorables (honorables are sons of peers), 47 baronets, 106 knights, 10 dames, 17 members of Parliament, a large number of obviously well-to-do people, including lawyers and hundreds of officers in the army and navy, and over a hundred doctors."

The above refers only to four breweries, while there are many breweries in London and in the smaller cities and towns in England. It is not surprising that a business so buttressed with financial and social influences can successfully resist reform. The people of the United States should pause and consider that, having once delivered themselves from the legal bondage of whisky and beer barons, it would be the height of undemocratic folly to return to that bondage again.

Lord Balfour of Burleigh has stated that he does not feel that state management is the most perfect method of control. He has also stated: The liquor trade is practically the only trade whose expansion does not form part of, or contribute to, the welfare of the nation. As opposed to the brewer the retailer is in a position of dependence and almost complete helplessness. The tenant has the work, the worry and the risk, and the brewer has the profits. The tenant who improves his house and his business is likely to have his rent raised until he is squeezed out altogether. The aim of the brewer is emphatically not to create places of general refreshment but beershops.

Again testified Lord Balfour: "Cases have come to my knowledge where the police have been in receipt of regular payments by licensees." Lord Astor also has mentioned two cases in which, it was alleged, cash was offered to two Parliamentary candidates—Conservative and Labor—for their support of the Trade. It will thus be seen that conditions in the United States years ago before the advent of Prohibition now exist in England. Again, payments to police can be made where there is no Eighteenth Amendment the same as where prohibitory laws exist. Let America take full notice that doing away with prohibitory laws does not correct abuses.

In Great Britain, as in America, the temperance cause suffers from the attitude of the metropolitan press. Almost all the daily newspapers openly stand for the traffic in intoxicants. They eagerly put up head-lines adverse to the temperance situation in America. Any "information" or dispatches from across the Atlantic presumedly prejudicial to Prohibition is quickly published, while the correction of misstatements is hardly given publicity. A credulous public is at times fed upon very silly local stories. Lord Astor has declared that the trade has found liberal advertising to be "a paying proposition." Some of the more important magazines or weeklies must derive large returns from whisky and beer ads. But when we recognize that some of the great newspapers of the United States covertly seek to mislead our people we cannot condemn the newspapers of England.

There are some notable exceptions to the above. The influential *Manchester Guardian,* generally so fair when referring to the United States, presents both sides of the question. The *Sunday Observer,* Lord Astor's weekly, does the same. A mutual friend informs me that Lord Astor has a very open mind and that his great idea is to break the power of the liquor traffic. Lady Astor, we may remember, is a native of Virginia and America may be proud of her. Her husband has testified that "the trade has tried continuously to get her out of public life."

"The trade" in Great Britain does not love reformers in the United States any more than it loves reformers in its own land. *Ridley's Wine and Spirit Circular,* the most influential organ of the wine and spirit trade in Great Britain, five years ago wrote:

> The American Nation, mostly of European extraction, have solemnly announced (by Prohibition) to the civilized world that they in America have become such Americanized beasts that they cannot be trusted even with so little as a glass of ale because of the certainty that the mark of the American beast would show forth in them, and under the influence of Alcohol they would run out and commit some crime.

On the other hand the temperance workers of brave old England look to America for sympathy and help. Our battle is their battle—their's is ours.

The reformers of England are doing some very fine work. Sir Josiah Stamp is considered the outstanding business man, the leading economist of Great Britain. In 1929, in an address before the Society for the Study of Inebriety, he presented a cold-blooded but convincing picture displaying the effect of alcohol on the economic life of his nation. I wish that lecture, reprinted from the *British Journal of Inebriety,* could be distributed all over the United States.

In the House of Lords there is a small but active group who follow Lord Astor. In the House of Commons a much larger temperance party makes itself politically felt. There is increasing opposition to the consumption of intoxicants on the part of brain workers, athletes, medical men and employers. Business men are beginning to more fully understand that if they are going to compete successfully with the United States conditions must be different among the "working classes." Dr. Eric Pearce Gould, F. R. C. S., the son of a great surgeon, and himself a leading surgeon, says: "A growing recognition of the very limited sphere of proper usefulness of alcohol has led, and is leading, to its gradual disappearance from routine use as a medicine." Lady Horsley, the widow of an eminent physician, has described herself as not a Prohibitionist, but as a renunciationist. Not too bad a term!

On this trip—my seventeenth visit to England—as compared with years ago, I notice a change for the better. Despite many gross evils, national sobriety among all classes has increased. Information received from various sources confirms these impressions. The automobile, the wireless, the radio, the cinema have contributed to the diminution of drunkenness. There are today 3,900 parishes in the tight little island wherein prohibition is enforced—mind enforced. There are fewer licensed houses to each 1,000 people than 20 years ago.

Recently I heard Sir Murray Hyslop address the International Congregational Council. He made a telling speech, which was received with enthusiasm by delegates from all over the world. He declared that Englishmen are so very conservative that it will require more than one generation to achieve the progress so far made by America. But victory will utimately be secured. He impressed the need of education and propaganda.

Every Christian voter of the United States is responsible not only for the uplift of his own country but for the uplift of other lands. In the midst of a glittering civilization our moral and material conditions rise or fall together. England knows that if we keep faithful to our prohibitionary pledges she also will be compelled to follow. Do we accept and will we vote according to our responsibility?

William C. Allen.

# The Study Table

## A Paradoxical Liberal

This is a baffling book.* Superficially regarded its thesis is a paradox and an earnest examination of the treatment of its thesis will reveal the fact that it abounds in paradoxical statements. Your reviewer, assuming a less pessimistic philosophy than the author, would hasten to say that the diagnosis of the ills of society, which is presented, is indisputable, and that this diagnosis is expounded with such brilliance that one stands aghast, is without question. It is in the suggested conclusions that the clarity is hardly maintained and in that the apparent hopelessness of the author leads him to assume the role of a prophet of doom, that as a brilliant and devoted religionist, he would hardly be expected to fill.

The thesis can be stated with brevity. It is an examination of the paradox of the chasm between the morality of the individual and the omnipresent immorality of society. Is this as real as Reinhold Niebuhr postulates? Does not the individual form a unit of society and is the collective organism so far inferior morally to the individual unit?

Every one has his own philosophy of life, that is to say, every one, after stumbling painfully for a certain period through this vale of pain, has learned certain difficult lessons from the hard knocks that have so plentifully come his way. He has perhaps learned to balance impulse with opportunity and circumstance, he has learned, almost as a superstitious ritual, to do certain things and to refrain from others, he believes now this, now that, of the life he finds so trying an affair, and so lurches unsteadily down the rough path, leaning one way and the other, as the warring inhibitions within him dictate.

Only a minority do, in a fuller sense, learn from the personal experiences some of us intellectually and some emotionally. While most of us only become sadder and wiser some do become better. It is well that there is a logic of the heart, as well as of the head, even though it does tend to make both individual and society vacillate between sentimentality (which Niebuhr abhors) and defeatism.

These conflicting logics are seldom found altogether apart and it has invariably been true that the heart is mightier than the head.

In the ten chapters and the introduction to his book Professor Niebuhr covers the whole gamut of human relationships, with especial emphasis upon the relationship of government, education and religion to human society. He seems to be equally pessimistic about the contributions of all three of these fundamental factors to the upbuilding of an ideal corporate structure. In so far as his examination of the effect of religion is concerned, he is, despite the fact that he is a teacher of religion, nearer to Spengler than to Paul Tillich, whose inspiring volume on "The Religious Situation" presents to some extent an antithesis of this pessimistic outlook.

It is utterly impossible, even if it were desirable, to examine in detail within the compass of a review, all the important issues raised by the book. It is a book to be read, re-read, inwardly digested, and worthy of sufficient study to affect the soul. It is moreover of sufficient import to justify examination of some of its postulations for a wider audience than the book itself may obtain. The tragedy of such a book is that it will be read by those who need it least and properly ignored by all good Rotarians, et al, all those who form the complacent herd of middle class, upon whom Niebuhr is so consistently and so rightfully severe.

In the opening chapter on "Man and Society—The Art of Living Together" we find these sentences—

> His concern (meaning society) for some centuries to come is not the creation of an ideal society in which there will be uncoerced and perfect peace and justice, but a society in which there will be enough justice, and in which coercion will be sufficiently non-violent to prevent his common enterprise from issuing into complete disaster.

Is there so much to quarrel with in this limitation of the possible achievement of society, granted it is true? Is it not a tremendous advance upon the limitation suggested by the christological concept of "total depravity"?

The limitations of political action engages attention at considerable length and there are many brilliant expositions of current shortcomings, with sagacious postulations as to their effect. Two or three of these must be projected into a comprehensive review.

> It must be taken for granted, therefore, that the injustices in society, which arise from class privileges, will not be abolished purely by moral suasion. That is a conviction at which the proletarian class, which suffers most from social injustice, has finally arrived after centuries of disappointed hopes.

It is doubtful whether the mass of the proletarian class have thought this through. Are not they, to an extent exceeding even the Babbitt class, puppets of pseudo-leadership almost as corrupt as the leadership of the middle class, or in other words, the victims of individual immorality?

> There are other redemptive forces in society beside those of proletarian spirituality. There are eyes which see clearly, other than those which have been clarified by his suffering; and there are wills which are resolute beside those which have been fortified by his bitter experience. Yet their number is restricted by the limits of the human imagination which permit only a few to see what they do not personally experience.

This quotation presents an undoubted truism but it is again testimony to the importance of the individual to the structure of society. What might be the effect of a larger vision by a greater number of individuals and is education on the one hand and religion on the other, doomed for ever to fail to create this larger vision for an increasing number?

> Comfortable classes may continue to dream of an automatic progress in society. They do not suffer enough from social injustice to recognize its peril to the life of society. Only the proletarian class sees how the centralization of power and privilege in modern society proceeds so rapidly that it not only outrages the conscience but destroys the very foundations of society.

Your reviewer does not quarrel with this statement but would suggest that the morass into which our technological advance has projected society tends to minimize the force of this postulation. The

*Moral Man and Immoral Society by Reinhold Niebuhr. Published by Charles Scribner Sons. $2.00.

middle class are suffering, probably not as severely as the proletarian, in actual material deprivation but nevertheless severely in a compulsory limitation of the graces of life which we are wont to call "standards" and in some cases and not a few beyond this limitation. There is a bitterness in this strata of society, which exceeds that in the proletarian class. It is undoubtedly engendered by an unaccustomed suffering but shall it not lead us to a more wholesome perspective?

The contrasting virtues and vices of revolutionary and evolutionary socialism are such that no purely rational moral choice is possible between them. Whatever judgments are made depend partly upon personal inclination; whether one prefers the partial preservation of traditional injustices or the risk of creating new iniquities by the attempt to abolish old ones completely. They depend partly upon the extent to which one suffers from traditional social abuses; and they are partly determined by the degree of crisis in which a society finds itself.

This constitutes an unequivocal acceptance of the import of personal rationalization which is but another term for "morale" and in effect a paradox, in so far as the central thesis of the book is concerned.

The examination of the part played by education, while again unduly pessimistic is a worthwhile exercise, in that it deals drastically with the complacent shibboleths of the proponents of the *status quo,* in the educational field. Two brief quotations from the introduction will give us the author's orientation:

The most persistent error of modern educators and moralists is the assumption that our social difficulties are due to the failure of the social sciences to keep pace with the physical sciences which have created our technological civilization. The invariable implication of this assumption is that, with a little more time, a little more adequate moral and social pedagogy and a generally higher development of human intelligence, our social problems will approach solution. . . . The real cause of social inertia, "our predatory self-interest," is mentioned only in passing without influencing his reasoning, and with no indication that he understands how much social conservatism is due to the economic interests of the owning classes.

To what extent shall the educator cease to uphold the "status quo" is the problem involved. Individual bravery has rudely thrust its shaft against the sadly embattled walls of educational snobbishness and will continue so to do until it is annihilated and the interests of the whole of society thus subserved.

The writer of this review is not disposed to take a Pollyanna attitude toward the paradoxical inconsistency between creed and deed which marks the transitional period between the dark ages of religious superstitution and the half-baked rationale of contemporary socialized religion, but even so, is unable to follow our author into the abyss of hopelessness as to its possible future effect upon individual morale and corporate advance.

The prophet Isaiah dreamed of the day when the lion and the lamb would lie down together, when, in other words, the law of nature which prompts the strong to devour the weak would be abrogated. . . . It was the peculiar genius of Jewish religious thought, that it conceived the millennium in this-worldly terms. . . . Wherever religion concerns itself with the problems of society, it always gives birth to some kind of millennial hope, from the perspective of which present social realities are convicted of inadequacy, and courage is maintained to continue in the effort to redeem society of injustice.

Writing from the background of adherence to Judaism the millennium is still conceived in this-worldly terms and the signs of religious progress, are as easily discernible as the signs of retrogression. It is true that a militant religious radicalism must supersede an anemic liberalism but UNITY, *"The World Tomorrow"* and perhaps *"The Christian Century"* suggest that this desiderata is not so far distant.

Perhaps a society which gradually approximates the ideal will not be so very far inferior morally to one which makes one desperate grasp after the ideal, only to find that the realities of history and nature dissolve it.

This is a virile sentence taken from a remarkable passage at the end of the chapter on "Justice Through Revolution" but it is an anachronistic one. The gradual approximation will be the effect of individual effort even though it be the resultant of the effort of a tiny minority.

As a generation we are therefore bound to feel harassed as well as disillusioned. . . . All this is rather tragic. For what the individual conscience feels when it lifts itself above the world of nature and the system of collective relationships in which the human spirit remains under the power of nature is not a luxury but a necessity of the soul. Yet there is beauty in our tragedy. We are, at least, rid of some of our illusions. We can no longer buy the highest satisfactions of the individual life at the expense of social injustice. We cannot build our individual ladders to heaven and leave the total human enterprise unredeemed of its excesses and corruptions.

Are not these sentences quoted from the closing pages of the book antipathetic? That force has been used heretofore to purchase human advance is indisputable. That our task is to come to terms with force is equally indisputable. What is force? Not of necessity violence and Niebuhr does not suggest this. Whitehead's definition of religion as the "theory of the inner life of man so far as it depends on man himself" gives us the key to the individual approach to the subjection of force or of power. Power of organization, in bootleg barons and racketeers, power of word in daily paper and book of the month club, power of wealth in General Motors or rum runners, power of nation in Mussolini or Hitler or the Republican Party, power of name in the Four Hundred or home-run hitters in fact of all kinds of power or force worshipped as an end in itself. May we not find comfort in the effort to subject these forces in a retrospect of history. Whither have gone the votaries of the philosophy of the subjection of power by force? Athens, Carthage, Rome, Alexander, Caesar, Napoleon, Attila, Genghis Khan, William the Second, Neitszche? Is this quarrel between Idealism and Realism new? Dean Inge puts in a vivid paragraph describing his conceptions of God at least in part, an answer to Niebuhr's somewhat pessimistic outlook. He says

If there is a God, He is certainly not like a capricious Oriental Sultan, from whom favors may be obtained by making friends with his courtiers. He is not a magnified Schoolmaster, distributing grades and prizes and punishments; and he is certainly not the Head of the Clerical profession. Sir John Seeley in his "Natural Religion" said that the man of science worships a nobler God than the average church goer; and I think he was right.

Ebb and flow in the spiritual life, as in the sea are necessary, are a sign of life not of death. In this ebb and flow there is life and the apparent chasm between individual morale and corporate standards may yet be reconciled without force, in the accepted sense of that term.

Albeit, a brilliant, thought provoking and manifestly worthwhile book.

EMANUEL STERNHEIM.

### Poets Show the Way

In an age when to be smart and callous is considered the fashionable pose for the young intellectual, it is a joy to discover three young men who are not ashamed of showing that they possess hearts as well as brains. To turn from the febrile vacuities of our "sad young men" leaning languidly on the gilded balustrades of ivory towers to "Christ in the Breadline"* is to turn from the lazy crooning of a radio performer to the stirring beauty of a cathedral choir.

UNITY readers should be particularly interested in this brochure because all three poets are contributors to its pages and especially because our own John Haynes Holmes has written a significant foreword in the direct and vivid speech which we always cherish from his pen.

Kenneth W. Porter, Seymour G. Link and Harry Elmore Hurd, all of them highly talented and well-known in the poetry world, have collaborated in a collection which contains some of the best poems of each of them, the majority of which center around the Christ figure and present, to quote Mr. Holmes, "the true Christ to a generation which uses its Christmas to no surer end than to demonstrate how little it either remembers or cares about the lowly Nazarene."

This book points the pathway which artists should take if they are to be constructive forces combatting the evils of an industrialized world. Economists give us planks and platforms to stand upon, from which the Promised Land can be seen stretching far and wide. But it is up to the artists and the poets of the world to provide the motive power of emotion to lead humanity toward the Mecca of brotherly living.

Let us rejoice in these three poets—not only for the poems they write but also for the spirit they foster, for being the exponents which they are of poetry, which may yet become "the trumpet of a prophecy!"

LUCIA TRENT.

*"Christ in the Breadline," by Kenneth W. Porter, Seymour Gordden Link, Harry Elmore Hurd. Published by the Driftwind Press, North Montpelier, Vermont.

## Correspondence

### "Civilized Drinking"

Editor of UNITY:

I was interested in the review of H. E. Barnes's new book, "Prohibition versus Civilization," by C. W. Reese in UNITY of February 6th.

In Iowa the majority of the Temperance workers have always held that drunkenness was a disease having serious effects on some organs, the mind and the moral fibre of men and women. For that reason Iowa built an Inebriate Hospital. For that reason Iowa early refused to license the stuff that causes the disease, and later outlawed the traffic. The physician who was in charge tells me they made few permanent cures. They could take away the craving but could not build up the moral stamina to resist the temptation to try it again.

Civilization has become a matter of so much doubt that it is hard to know just what Mr. Barnes means by "Civilized drinking." The good in even moderate social drinking is a matter of opinion depending much whether one likes it or does not. I doubt if my digestive tract is so very different from most humans even though it has sent me to several hospitals in this and other countries. Even though I have never taken any alcoholic beverage in every hospital I was asked if I drank. When in amusement I asked why, I was told that it would be very bad for me, even by doctors whose breath reeked with the fumes. Getting tired of the usual explanations in Paris and Switzerland, in Germany I put up a long face and said, "But surely here in Germany I can drink good German beer that we are assured builds one up?" "No, it would be very bad for you." "Then champagne or old wine?" "No, no, if you *must* have something some white wine occasionally will do you the least harm." Herr Doctor drank his liquor day after day while I gladly as always drank water.

The Noble Experiment has never been honestly tried. It was rather delivered to the politicians during Mr. Harding's administration to be administered for the benefit of politics. Too late Mr. Hoover came with an attempt to rescue it from political manipulations.

As well claim Outlawry of War a failure, as many do when they see war in a number of countries, even the League of Nations helpless to stop it and bring the criminal nations to trial. Is it not a tremendous step forward towards Peace that War is now a crime and nations who resort to it are criminals?

The same basic civil rights are flouted in suppressing the traffic in narcotics as that of alcoholic beverages. It is much to have men like Mr. Barnes and others agree that drunkards, like dope fiends, are victims of preventable diseases. Coming that far together the next step is for society to decide whether we will or will not sanction and profit by the traffic in the stuff that causes so many demoralized and demoralizing "patients."

OLIVE COLE SMITH.

*Mt. Pleasant, Iowa*

## The Field

(*Continued from Page* 2)

Hemisphere." (4) As reporters of their State's Marathon Round Table in 1-3 minute speeches. (5) On the last day's afternoon program. The official Who is Who on the Program boasted nineteen speakers, of whom sixteen were men. Remarkable statistics for an organization of one-fifth of the adult U. S. A. women.

### Quotations from Speeches

*Carrie Chapman Catt:* "Balance the national budget by reduction of war costs. When the United States has done this, other nations will follow. Why should we spend nearly three billions of dollars a year for war when no war is in sight? . . . The friends of peace are too silent and submissive! Remember Jericho, with walls impregnable, while the Children of Israel remained quiet; remember Joshua who came with his followers, making a great noise as they marched round and round the city with trumpets blowing and voices shouting! At the end of seven days, during which the noise never ceased, the old walls cracked and fell. The time appears to have come for trumpeting and shouting."

*W. van Kirk* demands: "Complete abolition of such *weapons of attack* as tanks, heavy artillery, battleships, and submarines."

*Dr. Mary E. Woolley:* "No one who saw the formal presentation of petitions in Geneva on the sixth day of last February will ever forget the impressiveness of that procession of women, bearing petitions from the countries circling the globe, with their 8,000,000 signatures, increased before the end of the first session to ten million. (Swollen by now to over 12 million, all resting peacefully in a vault in the cellar of the League of Nations palace, without any effect on the issue. R. S.) The anniversary of the day on which the petitions were presented, that is, February the sixth, 1933, should be a 'day of commemoration.'" (Wouldn't a day of mourning for the disregard of the will of 12 million petitioners be more appropriate?)

*Bruce Bliven,* speaking of the Stimson doctrine of refusal to recognize military conquest: "Others will not join the Stimson doctrine. U. S. A. alone will not be effective. In the long run the U. S. A. will have to give up." Since then the League of Nations Committee of Nineteen has unanimously decided to recommend non-recognition of Manchukuo in law and also non-co-operation with it in practice.

*Dr. Jacob H. Hollander,* Professor of Political Economy of Johns Hopkins University, who remarked that "in conversation among nations it is conventional never to call a spade a spade—but

always an agricultural implement," is opposed "to cancellation of the War Debts, or to any reduction except in the manner provided by the Funding Arrangements" . . . "We can not impose our judgment upon war-threatening nations, by fleets and armies. Our one resource in the cause of peace is our economic strength. Here are food and material and above all capital—to be withheld or supplied as right and justice, in our conception, shall determine. This is the one great chance of serving the cause of peace. Are we to cast it away?"

*Dr. Lewis L. Lorwin,* Institute of Economics of the Brookings Institution: "What is necessary is agreement of the nations of the world to set up a World Advisory Economic Council to study these problems continuously *and to make suggestions for international action.* . . Peace and freedom in the twentieth century imply new levels of international conduct and new planes of world cooperation."

*Dr. D. F. Fleming,* Vanderbilt University: "We cannot drift indefinitely. Future security, either for individuals or for nations, can hardly be obtained without building upon the all too well demonstrated fact that modern life has overleaped all national boundaries and that its regulation on a world scale is imperative. It is essential to progress, moreover, if not to survival itself, that international life shall be effectively organized before it is again disastrously disrupted by global war and its consequences. It is within the ability of every man to comprehend this necessity and to grasp the conclusion which follows. If the rule of law can develop civilization in areas so tremendous as our own nation, it must be capable of reasonable effective extension to the one field in which it is still to be established, the relations between the nations."

*Object Lesson:* On the 20th the C. C. C. voted a resolution of thanks to the Senate for granting President Hoover on the 19th the authority to declare an embargo, in co-operation with other countries, on arms shipments to troubled areas of the world. Prompt House indorsement was predicted. The Conference sent a delegation to the Senate to hand the resolution to Senator Borah. In the afternoon session Mrs. James Morrison reported that Borah could not accept the thanks, because within less than twenty-four hours after the authorization of the embargo, the munition interests defeated the measure.

*Frivolous Stories:* In midst of a very serious speech Dr. Mary E. Woolley announced: "I am going to tell two frivolous stories." Pencils, pads, handkerchiefs, handbags slide from many laps. The delegates are sitting up. "A boy employed in a store came one day an hour late. The boss asked: 'Why are you late?' 'I fell downstairs.' 'Didn't take long to do that.'" The other story was just as frivolous.

*Good Question:* Mrs. White, Virginia: "Is there any psychological reason for continual misuse of word Disarmament, instead of Reduction and Limitation of Armament?"

*Insincerity:* The delegates approved unanimously Mrs. Catt's suggestion to recommend Miss Woolley be retained as delegate to the Disarmament Conference. Many delegates had previously, in private discussion, suggested to ask that Florence Allen be appointed instead of Miss Woolley.

*Bookstand:* Not a single publication on poison gas warfare. One slim English booklet on international armament business.

*Understatement:* The co-operative organization of 12 million women called "Committee."

*High Spot:* The dramatized statistics on the waste of war in Mrs. Catt's playlet, "Mars takes a Sabbatical."

*Singing:* During occasional ventilating pauses: terrible.

*Best Chairman:* Stanley High; advised: "We should get good and mad. We need not more study but enthusiasm to act."

*Forces of Peace:* Frederick Libby declared: "The stars in heaven work for peace."

*Embarrassed Teachers:* A delegate asked for parallel instances of non-recognition of conquest. Permanent chairman calls on the speakers for an answer and announces: "The platform does not know of any." The gentlemen on the platform were Libby and Bruce Bliven. They did not know that f. i. Austria-Hungary's annexation of Bosnia and Hersegovina in 1908 was not recognized by the powers until the guilty party had paid Turkey an indemnity.

*Misinformation:* In answer to a question Bruce Bliven stated: "It is a historic fact that when a state comes into existence it becomes automatically recognized." Ye Gods!

*Timidity:* A delegate suggested "a white list" of newspapers which give peace and pacifism a fair deal. "Conference cannot take action on that."

*Wisecracks: Frederick Libby*: "Japan has lost her fight for Manchuria and has not yet found it out." To Mrs. Catt's question: "Are we going towards war or peace?" *Bruce Bliven* answered: "Towards peace but we have taken half an hour off for refreshments." *Frederick Libby:* "Towards peace, but haltingly."

*Promise:* The severe self criticism of many intelligent, younger delegates, impatient for action to cure war.

*Conclusion:* Draw your own!

ROSIKA SCHWIMMER.


**LaFollette's**

**Great National Weekly Newspaper**

**THE PROGRESSIVE**

In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government.

**SPECIAL OFFER**
**2 Months**
9 Issues **25c**

**STARTLING** facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 25 cents today and be sure to receive the next nine extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper.
The Progressive, Dept. B., Madison, Wis.



**Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.**

**Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.**

**Tear off and return:**

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....



*Subscribe to*

**The New Humanist**

*A Bi-Monthly Journal for Thoughtful and Selective Readers*

A critical and creative journal with man-centered interests. It neither duplicates nor competes. Concise in form it appeals particularly to those seeking substantial material in new fields. Our friends are our best copy-writers:

Harry Elmer Barnes says:

"The New Humanist is the journal of the vanguard in religious progress today. Its contributors are distinguished scholars and thinkers and the subjects covered are both urgent and diversified."

And John Dewey:

"There is valuable material in this journal which I do not find elsewhere. I am confident that there is a particular audience waiting for the ideas which are set forth in it."

As well as others:

"Dignified, scientific, stimulating and suggestive—" A. Eustace Haydon. "A refreshing oasis in the desert of compromise and dishonest thought," Rabbi Solomon Goldman. "Fulfills an altogether unique function in contemporary American life," Maynard Shipley.

*Per copy* 20c, *Annually* $1.00

**THE NEW HUMANIST**
**105 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.**